

ON AXIOMATIC DEFINITIONS OF NON-DISCRETE AFFINE BUILDINGS

CURTIS D. BENNETT AND PETRA N. SCHWER
WITH AN APPENDIX BY KOEN STRUYVE

ABSTRACT. In this paper we provide six different equivalent sets of axioms for affine Λ -buildings, by providing different types of metric conditions, exchange conditions, and atlas conditions. The work on atlas conditions builds on the work of Anne Parreau on equivalence of axioms for Euclidean buildings. The new axiom systems provide for potentially easier proofs that spaces are Λ -buildings. Moreover, we apply our result to show that the definition of a Euclidean building depends only on the topological equivalence class of the metric on the model space of the building. In an appendix a class of examples is constructed to illustrate the sharpness of the axioms dealing with metric conditions. These examples show that a space X defined over a given model space (with metric d) is possibly a building only if the distance function induced on X (by d) satisfies the triangle inequality.

1. INTRODUCTION

Euclidean buildings, also referred to as non-discrete affine or $\mathbb{R}$ -buildings, form one of the prime examples of $\text{CAT}(0)$ -spaces and were defined by Bruhat and Tits in [BT72] and [Tit86] to study Lie-type groups over local fields, as well as fields with non-discrete valuations.

The first author introduced the more general class of affine Λ -buildings (or more simply Λ -buildings) in [Ben90] and [Ben94], allowing for groups over Krull-valuation fields, that is fields having a valuation taking its values in an totally ordered abelian group Λ . Initially, the two main examples that were considered were the case of Lie type groups over the field $F(x, y)$ rational functions in two variables, with two possible valuations, namely, one into $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}$ lexicographically ordered, and the second onto the subgroup $\{x + y\pi \mid x, y \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ of $\mathbb{R}$. Care should be taken in the latter case that while geometrically the building can be naturally embedded in a traditional Euclidean building (by thinking of the valuation as landing in $\mathbb{R}$), the different topology of the underlying group can wreak havoc on many of the properties of and standard proofs on Euclidean buildings. Thus the Λ -building definition generalized both the notion of non-discrete $\mathbb{R}$ -buildings and that of Λ -trees.

Kramer and Tent made use of Λ -buildings in their study of asymptotic cones and their short proof of the Margulis conjecture [KT04], [KSTT05]. Recently these Λ -buildings have been studied by the second author in [Hit11] and [SnHS11], the latter showing that Λ -buildings are functorial in the underlying field and providing an alternative proof of Kleiner and Leeb's result [KL97] that asymptotic cones of $\mathbb{R}$ -buildings are again $\mathbb{R}$ -buildings.

One short-coming of the definition of non-discrete buildings and affine Λ -buildings is that often in the interesting cases, the axioms can be very hard to verify. This complication led Parreau [Par00] to find equivalent axioms for Bruhat-Tits buildings. In our work we undertake to generalize the work of Parreau to Λ -buildings, as well as to present other equivalent axiom systems that may prove easier to work with depending on the situation. As alluded to above,

Date: February 14, 2012.

The second author was financially supported by the SFB 478 "Geometric structure in mathematics" at the University of Münster and the DFG Project SCHW 1550/2-1. Her last name recently changed from Hitzelberger to Schwer. The third author is supported by the Fund for Scientific Research – Flanders (FWO - Vlaanderen).

while some of Parreau's proofs in the Bruhat-Tits situation carry over to Λ -buildings, any proof that uses compactness or connectedness properties of $\mathbb{R}$ must be reworked as Λ need not have these properties.

A second complication arises when looking at the definition of Λ -buildings. Namely, in the case that $\Lambda = \mathbb{R}$ the metric on $\mathbb{R}^n$ (which is a model for an apartment of the building) used to define the Λ -building is not the usual Euclidean metric. This begs the question of what importance does the choice of metric play. One consequence of our main theorem is that so long as the metrics are equivalent, there will be no change in the definition of a Λ -building. Moreover, in this case, the induced metric will necessarily satisfy the triangle inequality.

It is mentioned in [Ron89] that a certain subset of the classical axioms of Tits' is enough to guarantee that a certain space X modeled on a Λ -apartment $\mathbb{A}$ is in fact a Λ -building. However, it appears that there was a further assumption that the distance function induced on the space X by the metric on the model space $\mathbb{A}$ satisfies the triangle inequality as we can see by the construction given in the appendix, i.e. Section 9. See also Remark 3.3 in this regard.

The present paper is organized as follows: In Section 2 we define affine Λ -buildings and list the properties and axioms in consideration. After that we will present our main results in Section 3 where we also give an outline of their proofs. The detailed proofs are then given in Sections 4 through 8. Further details concerning the content of these sections are given after the statement of the main theorem on equivalent axiom sets in Section 3.

Finally, Section 9 is devoted to the construction of certain examples of spaces emphasising the sharpness of axiom (A5).

2. DEFINITIONS AND AXIOMS

The model apartment of an affine Λ -building is defined by means of a (not necessarily crystallographic) spherical root system Φ and a totally ordered abelian group Λ . Just as the apartments of Euclidean buildings are isomorphic copies of $\mathbb{R}^n$, the *model space* $\mathbb{A}$ of an affine Λ -building is isomorphic to Λ^n . We define

$$\mathbb{A}(\Phi, \Lambda) = \text{span}_F(\Phi) \otimes_F \Lambda,$$

where F is a sub-field of the real numbers containing all evaluations of co-roots on roots.

The spherical Weyl group $\overline{W}$ associated to Φ acts on $\mathbb{A}$ by naturally extending its action on Φ . We define a *hyperplane* H_α in the model space as a fixed point set of a reflection r_α in $\overline{W}$ which separates $\mathbb{A}$ into two half-spaces, called *half-apartments*. An *affine Weyl group* W_T acting on $\mathbb{A}$, is the semi-direct product of $\overline{W}$ by some $\overline{W}$ -invariant translation group T of the model space. In the case that T is the entire space $\mathbb{A}$ we will write W instead of W_T .

Associated to a basis B of the root system Φ there is a *fundamental Weyl chamber* $\mathcal{C}_f$. The chamber $\mathcal{C}_f$ is a fundamental domain for the action of $\overline{W}$ on $\mathbb{A}$. Its images in $\mathbb{A}$ under the affine Weyl group are *Weyl chambers* (sometimes called *sectors*). If two Weyl chambers contain a common sub-Weyl chamber we call them *parallel*. A *Weyl simplex* is a face of a chamber. The smallest face of dimension 0 is called *basepoint*, and a *panel* is a Weyl simplex of co-dimension one.

One can endow $\mathbb{A}$ with a natural W -invariant metric taking its values in Λ , and thus making $\mathbb{A}$ a Λ -metric space in the following sense: A map $d : X \times X \rightarrow \Lambda$ on a space X is a Λ -metric if for all x, y, z in X the following conditions are satisfied

- (1) $d(x, y) = 0$ if and only if $x = y$
- (2) $d(x, y) = d(y, x)$ and

- (3) the triangle inequality $d(x, z) + d(z, y) \geq d(x, y)$ holds.

While in principle there exist many different potential Λ -metrics for X , depending on Λ , the definition of one may be somewhat complicated. In the case where $\Lambda = \mathbb{R}$, the standard Euclidean metric works, however, in the case where square roots may not exist ($\Lambda = \mathbb{Q}$ or $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}$ for example) things can be more difficult. One such solution for all Λ is to use a modified Minkowski metric (see [Ben94] for details). We now define generalized non-discrete affine buildings. Throughout the following fix a model space $\mathbb{A}$ and an affine Weyl group W_T .

Definition 2.1. Let X be a set and $\mathcal{A}$, called the *atlas* of X , be a collection of injective charts $f : \mathbb{A} \hookrightarrow X$. For each f in $\mathcal{A}$, we call the images $f(\mathbb{A})$ *apartments* and define *Weyl chambers*, *Weyl simplices*, *hyperplanes*, *half-apartments*, *etc.* of X to be images of such in $\mathbb{A}$ under any f in $\mathcal{A}$. The pair $(X, \mathcal{A})$ is a (*generalized*) *affine building* (or Λ -building) if the following conditions are satisfied

- (A1) The atlas is invariant under pre-composition with elements of W_T .
- (A2) Given two charts $f, g \in \mathcal{A}$ with $f(\mathbb{A}) \cap g(\mathbb{A}) \neq \emptyset$. Then $f^{-1}(g(\mathbb{A}))$ is a closed convex subset of $\mathbb{A}$ and there exists $w \in W_T$ with $f|_{f^{-1}(g(\mathbb{A}))} = (g \circ w)|_{f^{-1}(g(\mathbb{A}))}$.
- (A3) For any pair of points in X there is an apartment containing both.

Given a Λ -metric $d_{\mathcal{A}}$ on the model space, axioms (A1)–(A3) imply the existence of a Λ -valued distance function on X , that is a function $d : X \times X \rightarrow \Lambda$ satisfying all conditions of the definition of a Λ -metric but the triangle inequality. The distance between points x, y in X is the distance between their pre-images under a chart f of an apartment containing both.

- (A4) Given two Weyl chambers in X there exist sub-Weyl chambers of both which are contained in a common apartment.
- (A5) For any apartment A and all $x \in A$ there exists a *retraction* $r_{A,x} : X \rightarrow A$ such that $r_{A,x}$ does not increase distances and $r_{A,x}^{-1}(x) = \{x\}$.
- (A6) Let f, g and h be charts such that the associated apartments pairwise intersect in half-apartments. Then $f(\mathbb{A}) \cap g(\mathbb{A}) \cap h(\mathbb{A}) \neq \emptyset$.

By (A5) the distance function d on X is well defined and satisfies the triangle inequality.

One problem raised by the definition is that condition (A5) relies on the choice of Λ -metric $d_{\mathbb{A}}$. However, in the case of $\Lambda = \mathbb{R}$ there are two natural Λ metrics to choose from, namely the standard Euclidean metric and the modified Minkowski metric of [Ben94]. More generally, there are potentially many possible metrics to choose from, and it would be helpful to have a better understanding of the role of the choice of metric in the definition (i.e., at what level does the definition depend on the choice of the metric). To keep our notation manageable, we will assume the metric on $\mathbb{A}$ is given as part of $\mathbb{A}$.

The main goal of the present paper is to prove equivalence of certain sets of axioms. From this equivalence, we will be able to show that for any two topologically equivalent metrics on $\mathbb{A}$ the definitions of a Λ -building for the given metrics are equivalent. Let us therefore collect all properties which are necessary to state the main result. These properties break into three categories, metric conditions, exchange conditions, and atlas conditions.

We begin with the two *metric conditions*. We note that (A5) is one such condition since it implies that the global distance function is a metric on the space X . In [Ben94], this condition is used to prove the existence of a building at infinity for a Λ -building. However, in [Par00] (for $\Lambda = \mathbb{R}$) and [Hit11] (for general Λ), proofs of the existence of the building at infinity¹ are given that do not require the full power of condition (A5). Consequently, there is benefit

¹In order to show that a given pair $(X, \mathcal{A})$ has a spherical building at infinity it is enough to assume that said pair satisfies axioms (A1)–(A4) and (TI).

to having the weaker condition necessary, namely that the induced distance function on X is a metric.

- (TI) (Triangle inequality) The distance function d on X , which exists assuming (A1)–(A3), is a metric, i.e. satisfies the triangle inequality.

We next move to the *exchange type conditions*. One difficulty with generalizing the definition of an $\mathbb{R}$ -building to the Λ -building case was that the totally ordered group Λ might not be topologically connected. In the case of trees (the lowest dimension affine buildings), the move from $\mathbb{R}$ -trees to Λ -trees required the introduction of a Y -condition, which is essentially a condition that says when two paths diverge, that the symmetric difference of those paths together with the point of divergence itself forms a path. For the higher dimensional Λ -building context, this condition was encapsulated in (A6). For our purposes, we have two other exchange conditions, each of which is slightly stronger than (A6). The first is most naturally an exchange condition, and hence we give it that name.

- (EC) (Exchange condition) Given two charts $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $f_1(\mathbb{A}) \cap f_2(\mathbb{A})$ is a half apartment, then there exists a chart $f_3 \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $f_3(\mathbb{A}) \cap f_j(\mathbb{A})$ is a half apartment for $j = 1, 2$. Moreover, $f_3(\mathbb{A})$ is the symmetric difference of $f_1(\mathbb{A})$ and $f_2(\mathbb{A})$ together with the boundary wall of $f_1(\mathbb{A}) \cap f_2(\mathbb{A})$.

Note that the exchange condition can be restated in “apartment language” as: Given two apartments A and B intersecting in a half-apartment M with boundary wall H , then the set $(A \oplus B) \cup H$ is also an apartment, where $\oplus$ denotes the symmetric difference of A and B .²

We will also consider the following even stronger exchange condition for which Linus Kramer suggested the name *sundial configuration*.

- (SC) (Sundial configuration) Suppose $f_1 \in \mathcal{A}$ and S is a Weyl chamber of $(X, \mathcal{A})$ such that $P = S \cap f_1(\mathbb{A})$ is a panel. Letting M be the wall of $f_1(\mathbb{A})$ containing P . Then there exist $f_2 \neq f_3 \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $f_1(\mathbb{A}) \cap f_j(\mathbb{A})$ is a half-apartment and $(M \cup S) \subset f_j(\mathbb{A})$ (for $j = 2, 3$).

The sundial configuration can be restated as: Given an apartment A of X and a chamber c in the building at infinity such that c shares a co-dimension one face p (a panel) with ∂A (the boundary of A or the apartment at infinity associated to A) but is not contained in the ∂A . Then there exist two apartments $A_1 \neq A_2$ such that $c \in \partial A_i, i = 1, 2$ and such that $A_i \cap A$ is a half apartment with bounding wall spanned by a panel in p .

The last set of conditions are the *atlas conditions*. These conditions all state properties of the atlas set $\mathcal{A}$ in terms of containing subsets of X . Thus conditions (A3) and (A4) are atlas conditions. These atlas conditions typically correspond to statements about objects (two points or Weyl chambers for example) being contained in an apartment (with one exception). To be more precise, we need some terminology.

We say that two Weyl simplices F and G *share the same germ* if both are based at the same vertex and if $F \cap G$ is a neighborhood of x in F and in G . It is easy to see that this is an equivalence relation on the set of Weyl simplices based at a given vertex. The equivalence class of an x -based Weyl simplex F is denoted by $\Delta_x F$ and is called the *germ of F at x* . The germs of Weyl simplices at a vertex x are partially ordered by inclusion: $\Delta_x F_1$ is contained in $\Delta_x F_2$ if there exist x -based representatives F'_1, F'_2 contained in a common apartment such that F'_1 is a face of F'_2 . Let $\Delta_x X$ be the set of all germs of Weyl simplices based at x . We note that since the definition of a germ is dependent on the definition of a neighborhood of a point, the notion of germs are necessarily dependent on the (equivalence class of the) metric on $\mathbb{A}$ with which we start.

²By definition $A \oplus B = \{x \in A \setminus B\} \cup \{x \in B \setminus A\}$.

A germ μ of a Weyl chamber S at x is *contained* in a set Y if there exists $\varepsilon \in \Lambda^+$ such that $S \cap B_\varepsilon(x)$ is contained in Y where $B_\varepsilon(x)$ denotes the usual ε -ball around x . We are now ready to state the first three of our new atlas conditions.

- (LA) (Large atlas) Any two germs of Weyl chambers are contained in a common apartment.
- (ALA) (Almost a large atlas) For all points x and all y -based Weyl chambers S there exists an apartment containing both x and $\Delta_y S$.
- (GG) (Locally a large atlas) Any two germs of Weyl chambers based at the same vertex are contained in a common apartment.

Note that both (LA) and (ALA) imply (A3).

We say two x -based germs are *opposite* if they are contained in a common apartment A and are images of one another under the longest element of the spherical Weyl group (which acts on the set of (germs of) x -based Weyl chambers in A).³ Two Weyl chambers are *opposite at x* , if their germs are opposite. This leads us to our fourth new atlas condition,

- (CO) (Opposite chambers) Two opposite x -based Weyl chambers S and T are contained in a unique common apartment.

For our last atlas condition, we need a metric notion of a “convex hull” like object. Thus, we define the *segment* $\text{seg}_X(x, y)$ of points x and y in a metric space X to be the set of all points $z \in X$ such that $d(x, y) = d(x, z) + d(z, y)$.

- (FC) (Finite cover) For all triples of points x, y and z in X and all apartments A containing x and y the segment $\text{seg}_A(x, y)$ is contained in a finite union of Weyl chambers based at z .

Remark 2.2. Both, the existence of a large atlas (LA) and its local analog (GG) were introduced by Parreau [Par00]. Condition (LA) was called (A3') in [Par00] according to its proximity to axiom (A3) and the abbreviation (GG) probably stood for “germ - germ”. The opposite chamber property (CO) also appeared in [Par00], where (CO) stood for “chambre opposées”. The condition (ALA) to almost have a large atlas is ‘in between’ (A3) and the existence of a large atlas and suffices for one of the implications in 3.2.

3. MAIN RESULTS

The purpose of this section is to state our main results.

Recall that we say that $(X, \mathcal{A})$ is a *space modeled on $\mathbb{A}$* if X is a set together with a collection $\mathcal{A}$ of injective *charts* $f : \mathbb{A} \hookrightarrow X$ such that X is covered by its charts. That is $X = \bigcup_{f \in \mathcal{A}} f(\mathbb{A})$. Throughout the remainder of the paper we will assume that conditions $(X, \mathcal{A})$ satisfies conditions (A1)–(A3).

Using explicit constructions and combinatorial properties of links and the building at infinity we prove in Proposition 5.1 that (A6) and the exchange condition (EC) are equivalent assuming (A1)–(A5) are also satisfied. By similar arguments we obtain in Proposition 5.2 that (EC) is implied by (A4) and the sundial configuration and that on the other hand (SC) follows from (A4), (A5) and (EC), that is (EC) and (SC) are equivalent. Hence we have

Proposition 3.1. *Let $(X, \mathcal{A})$ be a space modeled on $\mathbb{A} = \mathbb{A}(\Phi, \Lambda)$ such that axioms (A1)–(A5) are satisfied. Then*

$$(A6) \Leftrightarrow (SC) \Leftrightarrow (EC).$$

Summarizing all results proved in this paper we obtain the following theorem.

³It is easy to see that in the case where we know that the germs at x form a spherical building, then opposite germs are also opposite in the usual spherical building sense.

Theorem 3.2. *For a space $(X, \mathcal{A})$ modeled on $\mathbb{A} = \mathbb{A}(\Phi, \Lambda)$ which satisfies axioms (A1)–(A3), the following are equivalent:*

- (1) $(X, \mathcal{A})$ is an affine Λ -building, that is axioms (A4), (A5) and (A6) are satisfied.
- (2) $(X, \mathcal{A})$ satisfies (A4), (TI) and (A6).
- (3) $(X, \mathcal{A})$ satisfies (A4), (TI) and (SC).
- (4) $(X, \mathcal{A})$ satisfies (A4), (A5) and (SC).
- (5) $(X, \mathcal{A})$ satisfies (A4), (A5) and (EC).
- (6) $(X, \mathcal{A})$ satisfies (GG) and (CO).
- (7) $(X, \mathcal{A})$ satisfies (LA) and (CO).
- (8) $(X, \mathcal{A})$ satisfies (ALA), (A4), (FC) and (EC).

Before discussing the proof, it is worth saying a few words about the relationship of the various conditions. In particular, statements (2)–(5) correspond to various options on metric and exchange conditions. Statements (6) and (7) are the stronger versions of the atlas conditions (each having one on germs and one on Weyl chambers) that imply $(X, \mathcal{A})$ is an affine Λ -building, allowing us to ignore both metric and exchange conditions. Finally, statement (8) lets us use the weakest of the atlas conditions (in that (ALA) is weaker than (LA) and (A4) is often easier to show than (CO)) at the cost of the finite cover condition and the exchange condition. Also recall that both (LA) and (ALA) imply (A3).

Proof. To prove the above theorem we will show the following implications:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 (4) & \xleftrightarrow{\text{Prop. 5.2}} & (5) & \xleftrightarrow{\text{Sec. 7}} & (8) & & \\
 & & \updownarrow \text{Prop. 5.1} & & \up \text{Sec. 5,7,8} & & \\
 (3) & \xleftrightarrow{\text{Thm. 7.10}} & (1) & \implies & (2) & \xleftrightarrow{\text{Sec. 6}} & (6) \xleftrightarrow{\text{Sec. 4}} (7)
 \end{array}$$

By Proposition 3.1 we have that (1), (4) and (5) are equivalent. Equivalence of (1) and (3) is shown in Theorem 7.10. That (1) implies (2) and (7) implies (6) are obvious. Assuming (2) we obtain (GG) and (CO) as discussed in Section 6. For details see Corollaries 6.2 and 6.7. Hence item (2) implies (6).

In Section 4 we prove Proposition 4.4, which implies that (7) follows from (6).

By Proposition 5.3 the axioms listed under (6) imply that (EC) holds. In Proposition 7.4 it is shown that the finite cover condition (FC) follows from (A1)–(A3) and (CO). Finally we prove in Section 8 that axiom (A4) follows from (6). This completes the proof of the fact that (6) implies (8).

Axiom (A5) is verified in Section 7 using (A1), (A2) and condition (ALA) and (FC). Therefore item (8) implies (5). This completes the proof of our main result. $\square$

Remark 3.3. The original axiomatic definition of affine $\mathbb{R}$ -buildings is due to Jaques Tits, who defined the “système d’appartements” in [Tit86] by listing five axioms. The first four of these are precisely axioms (A1)–(A4) as presented above. His fifth axiom originally reads different from ours but was later replaced with what is now axiom (A5) as written in Definition 2.1. One can show that in case of $\mathbb{R}$ -buildings axioms (A6) follows from (A1)–(A5). In appendix 3 of [Ron89] it is stated that (A5) and (A6) are equivalent, which would imply that condition (TI) can be dropped in (2) of Theorem 3.2. It is however possible to construct examples of spaces satisfying (A1)–(A4) that vacuously satisfy (A6) but satisfy neither (A5) nor (TI). See Section 9 for details.

3.1. An application. In this section we explain a simple yet interesting consequence of Theorem 3.2 alluded to earlier. The class of affine Λ -buildings is a generalization of Euclidean buildings, which themselves generalize the (geometric realizations of) simplicial affine buildings. The affine Λ -buildings can be endowed with a Λ -metric.

Concerning the metric structure the following difficulty arises when viewing Euclidean buildings as the subclass of affine Λ -buildings where $\Lambda = \mathbb{R}$ and where the translational part T of the affine Weyl group equals the co-root-lattice spanned by a crystallographic root system, or is the full translation group of an apartment in the non-crystallographic case. When studying Euclidean buildings one usually uses the Euclidean metric on the model space. Compare for example [Par00] or Kleiner and Leeb [KL97].

The natural metric on the model space of an affine Λ -building is however defined in terms of the defining root system Φ , compare [Hit09], and is a generalization of the length of translations in apartments of simplicial affine buildings. This length function on the set of translational elements of the affine Weyl group is defined with respect to the length of certain minimal galleries. Hence this natural metric used for Λ -buildings is different from the Euclidean one in case $\Lambda = \mathbb{R}$.

The question arising is the following: Let us assume that X is an affine building with metric d , which is induced by a metric $d_{\mathbb{A}}$ on the model space. Let $d'_{\mathbb{A}}$ be a metric on the model space different from $d_{\mathbb{A}}$ and does hence induce a second distance function d' on X . Does d' satisfy the triangle inequality? And is (X, d') an affine building? To be able to answer these questions one has to understand whether the retractions appearing in (A5) do exist and are distance diminishing. Theorem 3.2 answers these questions with “yes”, so long as the metrics are topologically equivalent on $\mathbb{A}$.

Theorem 3.4. *Let $(X, \mathcal{A})$ be an affine building with metric d on X . Then every W -invariant metric d' topologically equivalent to d which can be defined on the model space extends to a metric on X . In particular “being a building” only depends on the equivalence class of d , not on the metric itself.*

Proof. Let $(X, \mathcal{A})$ be a building equipped with a metric d . Then for any topologically equivalent metric d' axioms (A6) and (A1) to (A4) are still satisfied, since these axioms do not contain conditions on the metric. In addition, since the metrics d and d' are topologically equivalent on the model space, they define the same germs of Weyl chambers. In particular, conditions (GG), (LA), and (ALA) are all satisfied for d' if they are satisfied for d . Since condition (CO) is independent of the metric, it follows that both statements (6) and (7) of 3.2 are true for d' also. Consequently $(X, \mathcal{A}, d')$ is also a Λ -building and the metric induced by d' satisfies (TI) by statement (2). $\square$

Thus whether or not a pair $(X, \mathcal{A})$ modeled on $\mathbb{A}$ is an affine building only depends on the topological equivalence class of the metric imposed on $\mathbb{A}$.

4. HAVING A LARGE ATLAS (LA)

Assume that $(X, \mathcal{A})$ is a pair satisfying axioms (A1) to (A3). Recall that the germs of Weyl simplices based at a vertex x are partially ordered by inclusion. A germ $\Delta_x S_1$ of a Weyl simplex S_1 is contained in $\Delta_x S_2$ if there exist x -based representatives S'_1, S'_2 contained in a common apartment such that S'_1 is a face of S'_2 . The *residue* $\Delta_x X$ of X at x is the set of all germs of Weyl simplices based at x .

Theorem 4.1. *Assume that $(X, \mathcal{A})$ has property (GG) in addition to (A1)–(A3). Then $\Delta_x X$ is a spherical building of type Φ for all x in X . Furthermore if in addition (A5) holds $\Delta_x X$ is independent of $\mathcal{A}$.*

Proof. We verify the axioms of the definition of a simplicial building, which can be found on page 76 in [Bro89]. It is easy to see that $\Delta_x X$ is a simplicial complex with the partial order defined above. It is a pure simplicial complex, since each germ of a face is contained in a germ of a Weyl chamber. The set of equivalence classes determined by a given apartment of X containing x is a subcomplex of $\Delta_x X$ which is a Coxeter complex of type Φ . Hence we define those to be the apartments of $\Delta_x X$. Therefore, by definition, each apartment is a Coxeter complex. Two apartments of $\Delta_x X$ are isomorphic via an isomorphism fixing the intersection of the corresponding apartments of X , hence fixing the intersection of the apartments of $\Delta_x X$ as well. Finally due to property (GG) any two chambers are contained in a common apartment and we can conclude that $\Delta_x X$ is a spherical building of type Φ .

Let $\mathcal{A}'$ be a different system of apartments of X . We will denote by Δ the spherical building of germs at x with respect to $\mathcal{A}$ and by Δ' the building at x with respect to $\mathcal{A}'$. Since spherical buildings have a unique apartment system the buildings Δ and Δ' are equal if they contain the same chambers. Let $c \in \Delta'$ be a chamber; we will show $c \in \Delta$. Let d be a chamber opposite c in Δ' and a' the unique apartment containing both. Then a' corresponds to an apartment A' of X having a chart in $\mathcal{A}'$ and there exist $\mathcal{A}'$ -Weyl chambers S_c, S_d contained in A' representing c and d , respectively. Choose a point y in the interior of S_c and let z be contained in the interior of S_d . By (A3) there exists a chart $f \in \mathcal{A}$ such that the image A of f contains y and z . By [Hit11, Prop. 6.2], which uses (A5), the point x is contained in A . And by construction the unique x -based Weyl chamber in A which contains y has germ x and the unique x -based Weyl chamber in A containing z has germ d . Thus $c \in \Delta$. Interchanging the roles of Δ and Δ' above we have that they contain the same chambers. Hence $\Delta = \Delta'$. $\square$

Lemma 4.2. *Assume in addition to (A1)–(A3) that $(X, \mathcal{A})$ satisfies (GG) and (CO) or, alternatively, that (A4), (TI), and (SC) are satisfied. Let S and T be two x -based Weyl chambers. Then there exists an apartment containing S and a germ of T at x .*

In case that (GG) and (CO) are satisfied, the proof is as in [Par00, Prop 1.15].

Proof. Assume (A4), (TI), and (SC). We write $d(S, T)$ for the Weyl group-valued Weyl chamber-distance of ∂S and ∂T in the spherical building at infinity and we similarly write $\delta(\mu, \nu)$ for the Weyl chamber-distance of germs μ and ν in a residue $\Delta_x X$. Taking ℓ to be the usual length function on Coxeter groups, we use $\ell(\delta(\mu, \nu))$, and $\ell(d(S, T))$ to denote the length of a minimal gallery connecting the germs μ and ν and respectively of the one connecting the chambers $\partial S, \partial T$ in the building at infinity. Further, let A_0 be an apartment containing S .

By axiom (A4) there exists an apartment A' containing sub-Weyl chambers S' of S and T' of T , and $\ell(d(S', T')) \geq \ell(d(S, T))$. Replace S' and T' by Weyl chambers in A' based at a common vertex $x' \in S$, consider a minimal-length sequence

$$S' = S_0, \dots, S_n = T',$$

of x' -based Weyl chambers. By construction A_0 contains S' . Let j be minimal such that S_{j+1} contains no sub-Weyl chamber in A_0 . If $j = n$ (i.e., T' has a sub-Weyl chamber T'' contained in A_0), then T'' is Weyl chamber of A_0 and, as $x \in A_0$, by convexity it follows that $T \subset A_0$ and there is nothing to prove. We will induct on $n - j$. The basis step having been proved, assume S_{j+1} has no sub-Weyl chamber contained in A_0 but $S_0, \dots, S_j$ all have sub-Weyl chambers in A_0 . In this case, there exists a Weyl chamber S'_{j+1} parallel to S_{j+1} (in A') such that $S'_j \cap A_0$ is a panel (parallel to a panel of S_j). By (SC) there exists an apartment A_{j+1} containing S'_{j+1} and the germ $\Delta_y S$ of the Weyl chamber S (since for any wall $\Delta_y S$ must lie on one side or the other of the wall). If S is contained in A_{j+1} , then we replace A_0 with A_{j+1} and by induction on $n - j$ we have the result. On the other hand, if $S \not\subset A_{j+1}$, let

S'' be the Weyl chamber of A_{j+1} with germ $\Delta_y S'' = \Delta_y S$. Then

$$\ell(d(T', S_{j+1})) = \ell(d(T, S_{j+1})) - 1.$$

Moreover, considering the case of S'' and T , together with A_{j+1} as our new A_0 , by induction there exists an apartment A containing $\Delta_y S''$ and T , with $\ell(\delta(\Delta_y S'', \Delta_y T)) \leq \ell(d(S'', T))$. However, $\Delta_y S = \Delta_y S''$ and

$$\ell(d(S'', T)) \leq \ell(d(S, T)) - 1.$$

Hence

$$\ell(\delta(\Delta_y S, \Delta_y T)) \leq \ell(d(S, T))$$

as desired. Note that if equality holds, then in each case, the apartment A_j contains S (where we take A_j as the apartment containing S_j and S_y in the proof), and in particular, A_n contains both S and T as desired. $\square$

Corollary 4.3. *Let $(X, \mathcal{A})$ be a pair satisfying axioms (A1)–(A4), (TI), and (SC). If S and T are Weyl chambers of X based at y , and $\delta(\Delta_y S, \Delta_y T)$ is maximal, then S and T are contained in a common apartment.*

Proof. Since $\delta(\Delta_y S, \Delta_y T)$ is maximal, the proof of Lemma 4.2 implies that $\ell(\delta(\Delta_y S, \Delta_y T)) = \ell(d(S, T))$. However, in this case the lemma implies the existence of an apartment A containing S and T . $\square$

Another proof of the above corollary can be found in 5.23 of [Hit09]. The following proposition was already proved in [Hit09, 5.15] using similar techniques.

Proposition 4.4. *Assume that $(X, \mathcal{A})$ satisfies either (GG) and (CO) or, alternatively, axioms (A4), (TI) and (SC). Then (LA) is satisfied as well.*

Proof. Let $\Delta_x S$ and $\Delta_y T$ be two germs of Weyl chambers S and T . We begin by showing that $\Delta_x S$ and y are contained in a common apartment B . By (A2), there exists an apartment A containing x and y . Let C be a Weyl chamber of A based at x containing y . By Lemma 4.2 there exists an apartment B of X containing $\Delta_x S$ and C . Take S' to be the Weyl chamber of B based at y containing $\Delta_x S$. Again by Lemma 4.2, there exists an apartment A' containing $\Delta_y T$ and S' . Since $\Delta_x S \subset S'$, it follows that A' contains $\Delta_y T$ and $\Delta_x S$ as desired. $\square$

5. EXCHANGE AXIOMS

In this section, we prove equivalence of the sundial configuration (SC), the exchange condition (EC) and axiom (A6) given that (A1)–(A5) are satisfied. Recall that (A1)–(A5) are enough to show that there exists a spherical building at infinity ([Hit09]). Given $(X, \mathcal{A})$, we will use the standard notation of $(\partial X, \partial \mathcal{A})$ to denote the associated spherical building at infinity, and given an apartment A of $\mathcal{A}$, we will write ∂A to denote the associated apartment at infinity. For notational convenience we will also use lower case letters for apartments in the building at infinity when not using the ∂ -notation.

Proposition 5.1. *Let $(X, \mathcal{A})$ be a pair satisfying conditions (A1)–(A5), then condition (A6) and the exchange condition (EC) are equivalent.*

Proof. First assume $(X, \mathcal{A})$ satisfies (A6). Suppose $A_1 = f_1(\mathbb{A})$ and $A_2 = f_2(\mathbb{A})$ are two apartments of X with $A_1 \cap A_2 = H$ a half-apartment. Then ∂A_1 and ∂A_2 are apartments of ∂X that intersect in a half-apartment with bounding wall m . By spherical building theory, it follows that there exists an apartment a_3 whose chambers are the chambers of $(\partial A_1 \oplus \partial A_2) \cup m$, further there exists an apartment A_3 of X with $\partial A_3 = a_3$.

Since $\partial A_1 \cap a_3$ is a half-apartment and $A_1 \cap A_3$ is convex by (A2), it follows that $A_1 \cap A_3$ is a half-apartment. Similarly $A_2 \cap A_3$ is a half-apartment. Condition (A6) now implies that

$A_1 \cap A_2 \cap A_3$ contains some element $x \in X$. Since $x \in H$ and a_3 contains the chambers of ∂A_1 that are not in ∂A_2 , it follows that A_3 contains $A_1 - H$. Similarly $A_2 - H \subset A_3$. By convexity the bounding wall M of H is contained in A_3 . But now the convexity of A_3 implies that $x \in M$ as otherwise the wall parallel to M through x would not separate points of $A_1 \cap A_3$ and $A_2 \cap A_3$. This implies that the exchange condition (EC) holds.

Now assume that (A1)–(A5) and (EC) are satisfied, and let A_1, A_2 , and A_3 be half apartments of X such that any two intersect in a half-apartment. By way of contradiction, suppose $A_1 \cap A_2 \cap A_3 = \emptyset$. Let $H_{i,j} = A_i \cap A_j$ for $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. Since $H_{1,2} \cap H_{1,3} = \emptyset$, it follows that if H is a half-apartment of A_1 with $H_{1,2} \cap H$ contained in the boundary M of H , then $H_{1,3} \cap H$ is again a half-apartment. Now the exchange condition (EC) implies that there exists an apartment A_4 such that $A_4 = (A_1 \oplus A_2) \cup M_{1,2}$, where $M_{1,2}$ stands for the bounding wall of $H_{1,2}$. Note that $H_{1,3} \subseteq A_4$, so that ∂A_4 consists of the same Weyl chambers as ∂A_3 . However, the apartments of X are in one-to-one correspondence with the apartments of ∂X . Therefore, $A_3 = A_4$. $\square$

Proposition 5.2. *Let $(X, \mathcal{A})$ be a pair satisfying conditions (A1)–(A3). Then the following implications hold:*

- if (A4), (A5) and (EC) are true, then (SC) is satisfied, and
- provided (A4) and (SC) hold, then (EC) does as well.

In particular, given (A1)–(A5) conditions (EC) and (SC) are equivalent.

Proof. Suppose $(X, \mathcal{A})$ satisfies conditions (A1)–(A5) and (EC). Let A_1 be an apartment and S a Weyl chamber such that $S \cap A_1$ is a panel of S . Then $\partial A_1 \cap \partial S$ is a panel in $\partial \mathcal{A}X$. Therefore there is an apartment a_2 of $\partial \mathcal{A}X$ such that $\partial S \in a_2$, and $\partial A_1 \cap a_2$ is a half-apartment. Let A_2 be the apartment of X with $\partial A_2 = a_2$. Since $\partial A_1 \cap a_2$ is a half-apartment the intersection $A_1 \cap A_2$ is a half-apartment. We now apply condition (EC) to obtain (SC).

Conversely, suppose $(X, \mathcal{A})$ satisfies conditions (A1)–(A4) and (SC), and let A_1 and A_2 be apartments of X intersecting in a half-apartment H . Let S be a Weyl chamber of A_2 such that $S \cap A_1$ is a panel P of S , and let M be the wall of A_1 containing P . By (SC), there exists an apartment A_3 containing M such that $A_1 \cap A_3$ is a half-apartment and $A_2 \cap A_3$ is a half-apartment (as A_2 must be one of the apartments whose existence is guaranteed by (SC)) containing $M \cup S$. By convexity, it follows that $A_3 = (A_1 \oplus A_2) \cup M$ as desired. $\square$

The following proposition is used in the proof of Theorem 3.2 in order to show that item (6) implies item (8).

Proposition 5.3. *Let $(X, \mathcal{A})$ be a pair satisfying axioms (A1)–(A3) and (CO) and assume that the germs at each vertex form a spherical building. (By 4.1 this is true assuming (GG), for example.) Then the exchange condition (EC) is satisfied.*

Proof. Let A and B be apartments intersecting in an half-apartment M . Let x be a point contained in the bounding wall H of M . By assumption $\Delta_x X$ is a spherical building. Therefore the union of $\Delta_x(A \setminus M)$, $\Delta_x(B \setminus M)$ and $\Delta_x H$ is an apartment in $\Delta_x X$, which we denote by $\Delta_x A'$.

We choose two opposite germs μ and σ at x which are contained in $\Delta_x(A \setminus M)$ and $\Delta_x(B \setminus M)$, respectively. Let T be the unique Weyl chamber in A having germ μ and let S be the unique Weyl chamber in B with germ σ . By construction S and T are opposite and thus condition (CO) implies that the Weyl chambers S and T are contained in a common apartment A'' . Since two opposite Weyl chambers contained in the same apartment determine this apartment uniquely we can conclude that $\Delta_x A'' = \Delta_x A'$. We conclude that $A'' \cap ((A \oplus B) \cup H)$ contains S , T and $\Delta_x A'$. Axiom (A2) says that apartments intersect in convex sets. Therefore $A'' \cap (B \setminus M) = B \setminus M$ and $A'' \cap (A \setminus M) = A \setminus M$ which implies that $A'' \cap ((A \oplus B) \cup H) = A''$. $\square$

6. LOCAL STRUCTURE

Recall that we say a germ μ of a Weyl chamber S at x is *contained in a set* Y if there exists $\varepsilon \in \Lambda^+$ such that $S \cap B_\varepsilon(x)$ is contained in Y .

In the following let $(X, \mathcal{A})$ be a pair satisfying (A1)–(A4), (TI) and (A6).

Proposition 6.1. *Let c be a chamber in $\partial_{\mathcal{A}}X$ and S an x -based Weyl chamber in X . Then there exists an apartment A such that $\Delta_x S$ is contained in A and such that c is a chamber of ∂A .*

The proof of the proposition above is as in [Par00, Prop. 1.8]. As a direct consequence we obtain:

Corollary 6.2. *Any such pair has property (GG).*

By the previous corollary $(X, \mathcal{A})$ satisfies the assertion of Theorem 4.1, i.e. the germs at a fixed vertex form a spherical building.

Proposition 6.3. *$(X, \mathcal{A})$ has a large atlas (LA).*

Proof. We need to prove that if S and T are Weyl chambers based at x and y , respectively, then there exists an apartment containing a germ of S at x and a germ of T at y .

By axiom (A3) there exists an apartment A containing x and y . We choose an x -based Weyl chamber S_{xy} in A that contains y and denote by S_{yx} the Weyl chamber based at y such that ∂S_{xy} and ∂S_{yx} are opposite in ∂A . Then x is contained in S_{yx} . If $\Delta_y T$ is not contained in A apply Proposition 6.1 to obtain an apartment A' containing a germ of T at y and containing ∂S_{yx} at infinity. But then x is also contained in A' .

Let us denote by S'_{xy} the unique Weyl chamber contained in A' having the same germ as S_{xy} at x . Without loss of generality we may assume that the germ $\Delta_y T$ is contained in S'_{xy} . Otherwise y is contained in a face of S'_{xy} and we can replace S'_{xy} by an adjacent Weyl chamber in A' satisfying this condition. A second application of 6.1 to $\partial S'_{xy}$ and the germ of S at x yields an apartment A'' containing $\Delta_x S$ and S'_{xy} and therefore $\Delta_y T$. $\square$

Propositions 6.4 to 6.6 below are due to Linus Kramer. A proof of 6.4 can be found in [Hit09, Prop. 5.20].

Proposition 6.4. *Let A_i with $i = 1, 2, 3$ be three apartments of X pairwise intersecting in half-apartments. Then $A_1 \cap A_2 \cap A_3$ is either a half-apartment or a hyperplane.*

Proposition 6.5. *$(X, \mathcal{A})$ satisfies (SC).*

Proof. Let A be an apartment in X and c a chamber not contained in ∂A but containing a panel of ∂A . Then c is opposite two uniquely determined chambers d_1 and d_2 in ∂A . Since any pair of opposite chambers is contained in a common apartment, there exist apartments A_1 and A_2 of X such that ∂A_i contains d_i and c with $i = 1, 2$. The three apartments $\partial A_1, \partial A_2$ and ∂A pairwise intersect in half-apartments. $\square$

Axiom (A6) together with the proposition above implies that the three apartments of the sundial configuration intersect in a hyperplane.

For any point $x \in X$ one can define a natural projection $\pi : \partial_{\mathcal{A}}X \rightarrow \Delta_x X$ from the building at infinity to the residue at x as follows. Let c be a chamber at infinity. Then there exists a unique Weyl chamber S based at x such that $\partial S = c$. Let $\pi(c) = \Delta_x S$.

Proposition 6.6. *Let $(c_0, \dots, c_k)$ be a minimal gallery in the building at infinity, x a point in X and for all i denote by S_i the x -based representative of c_i . If $(\pi_x(c_0), \dots, \pi_x(c_k))$ is minimal in $\Delta_x X$, then there exists an apartment containing $\bigcup_{i=0}^k S_i$.*

This follows by induction over k using Proposition 6.5 as in [Hit09, Prop. 5.22].

Corollary 6.7. *If $(X, \mathcal{A})$ satisfy properties (A1)–(A4), (TI), and (A6) then it also satisfies property (CO).*

Proof. Let S and T be Weyl simplices opposite at x . Choose a minimal gallery $(c_0, c_1, \dots, c_n)$ from $c_0 = \partial S$ to $c_n = \partial T$ and consider the representatives S_i of c_i based at x . With $S_0 = S$ and $S_n = T$ Proposition 6.6 implies the assertion. $\square$

7. RETRACTIONS BASED AT GERMS

In this section unless otherwise otherwise stated let $(X, \mathcal{A})$ be a pair satisfying axioms (A1), (A2) and assume there is an almost large atlas (ALA) (implying (A3) also). Further fix an apartment A in X with chart $f \in \mathcal{A}$.

Definition 7.1. Let μ be a germ of a Weyl chamber and y a point in X , then, by (ALA), there exists a chart $g \in \mathcal{A}$ such that y and μ are contained in $g(\mathbb{A})$. By axiom (A2) there exists $w \in W$ such that $g|_{g^{-1}(f(\mathbb{A}))} = (f \circ w)|_{g^{-1}(f(\mathbb{A}))}$. Hence we can define

$$r_{A,\mu}(y) = (f \circ w \circ g^{-1})(y).$$

The map $r_{A,\mu}$ is called *retraction onto A centered at μ* .

Proposition 7.2. *Let μ be a germ of a Weyl chamber in A . Then $r_{A,\mu}$ is well defined and the restriction of $r_{A,\mu}$ to any apartment A' containing μ is an isomorphism onto A .*

Proof. By (A2) the map $r_{A,\mu}$ is well defined. Since each map $w \in W$ preserves the distance on the model space $\mathbb{A}$, we have that $d(y, z) = d(r_{A,\mu}(y), r_{A,\mu}(z))$ for all $y, z \in X$ such that y, z , and μ are contained in a common apartment. Hence the second assertion follows. $\square$

We now introduce finite covering properties which will allow us to prove that under certain conditions the defined retractions based at germs are distance diminishing.

Lemma 7.3. *Assume $(X, \mathcal{A})$ is a pair satisfying (A1)–(A3) and property (CO). Let A be an apartment of X and $z \in X$ a point. Then A is contained in the (finite) union of all z -based Weyl chambers parallel to a Weyl chamber in A , that is all Weyl chambers S based at z with $\partial S \in \partial A$.*

Proof. In case z is contained in A this is obvious. Hence we assume that z is not contained in A . For all $p \in A$ there exists, by (A3), an apartment A' containing z and p . Let $S_+ \subset A'$ be a p -based Weyl chamber containing z . We denote by σ_+ its germ at p . There exists a p -based Weyl chamber S_- in A such that its germ σ_- is opposite σ_+ at p , i.e. these two germs are images of one another under the longest element of the spherical Weyl group interpreted as the point stabilizer of p in A . By property (CO) the Weyl chambers S_- and S_+ are contained in a common apartment A'' . Let T be the unique z -based translate of S_- in A'' . Since $z \in S_+$ and σ_+ and σ_- are opposite we have that $S_- \subset T$. In particular p is contained in T . $\square$

Proposition 7.4. *Assume $(X, \mathcal{A})$ is a pair satisfying (A1)–(A3) and properties (GG) and (CO), then the finite cover condition (FC) is satisfied. Further, if μ is a z -based germ of a Weyl chamber, then the segment between two points x and y in an apartment A is contained in a finite union of apartments containing μ .*

Proof. Condition (FC) follows by Lemma 7.3. To show the rest let I be the (finite) index set of the z -based Weyl chambers S_i with equivalence class in ∂A . By 7.3, we may conclude that $\text{seg}_A(x, y) \subset A \subset \bigcup_{i \in I} S_i$. We fix i and deduce from (GG) that there is an apartment A_i containing μ and $\Delta_z S_i$. Let S_i^{op} be a Weyl chamber in A_i whose germ is opposite $\Delta_z S_i$. Then (CO) implies that there is a unique apartment A'_i containing the union of S_i and S_i^{op} . Hence A and therefore $\text{seg}_A(x, y)$ is contained in $\bigcup_{i \in I} A'_i$. Hence the proposition. $\square$

Next we show a local version of the sundial configuration.

7.5. *From now on assume that $(X, \mathcal{A})$ is a pair satisfying conditions (A1)–(A4), (TI) and the sundial configuration (SC).*

Lemma 7.6. *With $(X, \mathcal{A})$ as in 7.5 let A be an apartment of X and $\Delta_x S$ a germ of a Weyl chamber such that $\Delta_x S \cap A$ is a panel-germ $\Delta_x P$. Then there exist apartments A' and A'' such that $\Delta_x S \in A' \cap A''$ and $A \subset A' \cup A''$.*

Proof. By (SC) it suffices to show that there is a Weyl chamber S' of X intersecting A in a panel such that $\Delta_x S' = \Delta_x S$. Let T be a Weyl chamber of A based at x having a panel containing the panel-germ $\Delta_x P$. By Lemma 4.2 there exists an apartment B containing T and $\Delta_x S$. Let S' be the Weyl chamber of B having the panel-germ $\Delta_x S$. Then S' has P' as a panel. Moreover, by convexity, if $S' \cap A \neq P'$, then $\Delta_x S = \Delta_x S' \subset A$ contrary to our hypothesis. Therefore $S' \cap A = P'$ and by (SC) there exist apartments A' and A'' such that $S' \subset A' \cap A''$ and $A \subset A' \cup A''$. $\square$

This exchange condition allows us to work with germs based at a common point, much as in the simplicial buildings case one works with chambers in a spherical residue. The assertion of the following proposition is similar to the finite cover condition (FC) shown in Proposition 7.4. However, the assumptions made in 7.4 differ from the ones here.

Proposition 7.7. *Suppose $(X, \mathcal{A})$ is as in 7.5. Let A and B be apartments of X and $\Delta_x S$ a germ of a Weyl chamber in A . Then for every point $y \in B$ there exists a Weyl chamber T of B such that*

- (1) *the x -based Weyl chamber T' parallel to T contains y , and*
- (2) *there exists an apartment A' of X containing T and $\Delta_x S$.*

Proof. By Proposition 4.4, for every Weyl chamber T of B based at y , there exists an apartment B' of X containing $\Delta_y T$ and $\Delta_x S$. Let S' denote the Weyl chamber of B' based at y containing $\Delta_x S$. Choose T such that $\ell(\delta(\Delta_y T, \Delta_y S'))$ is maximal.

If $\Delta_y T$ and $\Delta_y S'$ are not opposite (that is $\delta(\Delta_y T, \Delta_y S')$ is not the longest element of $\overline{W}$) then let $\Delta_y P$ be a panel germ of $\Delta_y T$ such that the wall M of B' through $\Delta_y P$ does not separate $\Delta_y T$ and S' . In the apartment B there exists a Weyl chamber R such that $\Delta_y R$ shares $\Delta_y P$ with $\Delta_y T$.

Lemma 7.6 implies, that there exists an apartment B'' containing S' and $\Delta_y R$. Hence, since $\Delta_y T$ and S' lie on the same side of M , by convexity the apartment B'' also contains $\Delta_y T$. In B'' , we then have $\ell(\delta(\Delta_y R, \Delta_y S')) = \ell(\delta(\Delta_y T, \Delta_y S')) + 1$, contradicting the choice of T .

Hence we may assume that $\Delta_y T$ and $\Delta_y S'$ are opposite. By Corollary 4.3, there exists an apartment A' of X containing S' and T . But $\Delta_x S \subset S'$, so that $\Delta_x S \subset A'$. Moreover, since A' contains T , take T' to be the Weyl chamber based at x parallel to T (in A'). Since T and S' were opposite Weyl chambers and $x \in T$, it follows that $y \in T'$, completing the proof of the proposition. $\square$

Corollary 7.8. *Suppose that either $(X, \mathcal{A})$ is as in 7.5 or is a pair satisfying (A1), (A2), (ALA), and (FC). Let A, B be apartments of X and $\Delta_x S$ a germ of a Weyl chamber in A . Then there exist closed convex sets $X_1, \dots, X_n$ in B such that*

- (1) $B = X_1 \cup \dots \cup X_n$ and
 (2) and for each i there is an apartment containing X_i and $\Delta_x S$.

Proof. In the first case Proposition 7.7 implies that there exist x -based Weyl chambers $S_1, S_2, \dots, S_n$ and apartments $A_i, i = 1, \dots, n$ such that S_i and $\Delta_x S$ is contained in A_i for all i . In the second case let $S_1, \dots, S_n$ be the Weyl chambers provided by the finite cover condition (FC). Set $X_i = S_i \cap B$ and the corollary follows. $\square$

We are now ready to prove that the retractions in consideration are distance diminishing.

Proposition 7.9. *Let $(X, \mathcal{A})$ be as in 7.5 or a pair satisfying axioms (A1), (A2), (ALA), and (FC). Then for all apartments A and germs μ of Weyl chambers contained in A the retraction $r_{A,\mu}$ defined in 7.1 is distance non-increasing. In particular we conclude that the pair $(X, \mathcal{A})$ satisfies axiom (A5).*

Proof. Assuming X is as in 7.5 condition (LA) is satisfied by Proposition 4.4. Hence using Proposition 7.2 in both cases we can conclude: if B is an apartment containing μ, y , and z then $d(y, z) = d(r_{A,\mu}(y), r_{A,\mu}(z))$, so the result holds true. Now, suppose y and z are arbitrary. By (A2) there exists an apartment B containing y and z . By Corollary 7.8 there exists closed convex sets $X_1, \dots, X_n$ such that $B = \bigcup_{i=1}^n X_i$ and each X_i is contained in a common apartment with $\Delta_x S$. Since each X_i is convex and closed, there exists a sequence of points $y = y_0, y_1, \dots, y_k = z$ such that $y_{i-1}, y_i \in X_{j_i}$ for some $j_1, \dots, j_k$ and y_i is in the convex hull of y_{i-1} and y_{i+1} for $i = 1, \dots, k-1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} d(y, z) &= \sum_{i=1}^k d(y_{i-1}, y_i) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^k d(r_{A,\mu}(y_{i-1}), r_{A,\mu}(y_i)) \\ &\geq d(r_{A,\mu}(y_0), r_{A,\mu}(y_k)) = d(r_{A,\mu}(y), r_{A,\mu}(z)), \end{aligned}$$

where we use the triangle inequality for d restricted to A in the next to the last step. Thus, $r_{A,\mu}$ is distance diminishing and hence a retraction with the required properties of (A5). $\square$

We now wish to show that condition (SC) can replace conditions (A5) and (A6) in the definition of an affine Λ -building.

Proposition 7.10. *Suppose $(X, \mathcal{A})$ satisfies axioms (A1)–(A4). Then conditions (TI) and (A6) together are equivalent to the sundial configuration (SC). In other words: in Theorem 3.2 item (1) is equivalent to (3).*

Proof. Since we have already shown in Section 5 that (SC) is satisfied by an affine Λ -building X , and that (A6) can be replaced by (SC), it remains to show that axioms (A1)–(A4), (TI) and (SC) imply the retraction condition (A5). This follows from Propositions 7.2 and 7.9, which completes the proof. $\square$

8. VERIFYING (A4)

Assume that $(X, \mathcal{A})$ is a pair satisfying axioms (A1)–(A3) and properties (GG) and (CO). By Theorem 4.1 these assumptions are enough to conclude that the germs at a given vertex form a spherical building.

Proposition 8.1. *Under the above assumptions, the pair $(X, \mathcal{A})$ satisfies (A4).*

Proof. Let S and T be two Weyl chambers in X . We will show that by passing to sub-Weyl chambers S' and T' we will find an apartment containing both S' and T' .

Given a point $x \in T$ we denote by T_x and S_x , the unique x -based Weyl chambers parallel to T and S , where the latter exists by [Hit09, Cor 5.11]. We denote by $\delta(x)$ the length of a minimal gallery from $\Delta_x S$ to $\Delta_x T$ in the spherical building $\Delta_x X$. Since the number of possible values for $\delta(x)$ is finite we may without loss of generality (by choosing different sub-Weyl chambers of C' if necessary) assume that x is chosen such that $\delta(x)$ is maximal.

Now replace S by S_x and T by T_x where x is chosen such that $\delta(x)$ is maximal. By Lemma 4.2 there exists an apartment A containing T and a germ of S at x and we denote by S' the x -based Weyl chamber in A which is opposite S at x . Property (CO) implies that there is an apartment A' containing S and S' . By (A2) the intersection $A \cap T$ is a convex subset of T . Let z be a point in this intersection. The unique z -based Weyl chambers S_z and S'_z parallel to S and S' , respectively, are both contained in A' . By construction the length of a minimal gallery from $\Delta_z S_z$ to $\Delta_z T_z$ is not greater than $\delta(x)$. On the other hand, since T and S' are both contained in the apartment A , we can conclude

$$\delta_z(T_z, S'_z) = \delta_x(T, S') = d - \delta_x(S, T) = d - \delta(x)$$

where d is the diameter of an apartment of $\Delta_x X$, that is the diameter of the spherical Coxeter complex associated to the underlying root system Φ . The function δ_x assigns to two x -based Weyl chambers the length of a minimal gallery connecting their germs in $\Delta_x X$.

The germ $\Delta_z T_z$ lies on a minimal gallery connecting the opposite germs $\Delta_z S_z$ and $\Delta_z S'_z$. Such a minimal gallery is contained in the unique apartment containing $\Delta_z S_z$ and $\Delta_z S'_z$, which is $\Delta_z A'$. Therefore $\Delta_z T_z$ is contained in $\Delta_z A'$ as well. This allows us to conclude that $A' \cap T$ contains a germ of T_z . One can observe that $A' \cap T$ is a convex subset of T containing x which is open relative to T . Hence the Weyl chamber T is contained in A' . Thus (A4) follows. $\square$

9. APPENDIX: SHARPNESS OF AXIOM (A5)

by Koen Struyve

This section is devoted to the following question: Let $(X, \mathcal{A})$ be a space modeled on $\mathbb{A} = \mathbb{A}(\Phi, \Lambda)$, which satisfies axioms (A1)–(A4) and (A6). Is $(X, \mathcal{A})$ again an affine Λ -building?

We will construct examples of such spaces which vacuously satisfy (A6) but do not satisfy either (A5) nor (TI), answering the above question in the negative.

9.1. Some additional definitions. The images in the model space $\mathbb{A}$ of the fundamental Weyl chamber $\mathcal{C}_f$ under the spherical Weyl group $\overline{W}$ will be called *vector Weyl chambers*. The unique fixed point in $\mathbb{A}$ of this group (so the basepoint of all the vector Weyl chambers) is denoted by o . The image of a vector Weyl chamber under a chart will again be called such.

We call the closed ball $\{x \in \mathbb{A} \mid d(o, x) \leq \lambda\}$ and their images under charts *centered balls with radius λ* .

Recall that if two Weyl chambers contain a common Weyl chamber we call them *parallel*. If an atlas satisfies axiom (A2), then this relation forms an equivalence relation.

A space modeled $(X, \mathcal{A})$ modeled on $\mathbb{A} = \mathbb{A}(\Phi, \Lambda)$ will be called λ -*admissible* if the following conditions are satisfied.

- (T0) No two injections in $\mathcal{A}$ have the same image.
- (T1) $(X, \mathcal{A})$ satisfies the axiom (A2).

- (T2) If two apartments intersect, then they either intersect in a single point contained in the centered balls with radius λ of both apartments, or they intersect in a Weyl chamber contained in the interior of vector Weyl chambers in both apartments.
- (T3) All the vector Weyl chambers in one parallelism class contain a common sub-Weyl chamber.

Fix a sequence $(\lambda_i)_{i=1,2,\dots}$ with $\lambda_i \in \Lambda$ such that $0 < \lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < \dots$ and the sequence converges to infinity.

9.2. Extension procedure. In this section, we will construct from a given λ_i -admissible space $(X_i, \mathcal{A}_i)$ ($i \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$) a λ_{i+1} -admissible space $(X_{i+1}, \mathcal{A}_{i+1})$, extending the previous one.

9.2.1. Step 1: Covering pairs of points. Let P be the set of pairs of points (up to order) in centered balls with radius λ_{i+1} in X_i not yet covered by a common apartment. For each pair $p := (x, y)$ in P we choose distinct points x_p and y_p in the centered ball of radius λ_{i+1} of a copy $\mathbb{A}_p$ of the model space $\mathbb{A}$. Let π_p be the canonical isometry from $\mathbb{A}$ to $\mathbb{A}_p$.

We now define X'_i to be the union of the sets X_i and $\mathbb{A}_p \setminus \{x_p, y_p\}$ for each $p := (x, y)$ in P . The set of charts $\mathcal{A}'_i$ is defined as the set of charts $\mathcal{A}_i$ together with a chart

$$f_p : a \in \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \begin{cases} \pi_p(a) & \text{if } x_p \neq \pi_p(a) \neq y_p \\ x & \text{if } \pi(a_p) = x_p \\ y & \text{if } \pi(a_p) = y_p \end{cases}$$

for each $p := (x, y)$ in P .

It is straightforward to verify that the newly obtained space $(X'_i, \mathcal{A}'_i)$ satisfies conditions (T0) up to (T3) (with $\lambda = \lambda_{i+1}$), and hence is an λ_{i+1} -admissible space.

9.2.2. Step 2: Covering pairs of sectors. We will now extend $(X'_i, \mathcal{A}'_i)$ to a λ_{i+1} -admissible space $(X_{i+1}, \mathcal{A}_{i+1})$.

Let Q be the set of parallelism classes of Weyl chambers in X'_i . For each class $q \in Q$, consider all vector Weyl chambers in this parallelism class. We know that these vector Weyl chambers contain a common sub-Weyl chamber by condition (T3). Condition (T2) together with the definition of vector Weyl chambers then implies that there exists a sub-Weyl chamber which has no points in common with the centered balls of radius λ_{i+1} in any apartment. Fix such a sub-Weyl chamber S_q .

Let R be the set of pairs (up to order) of parallelism classes of sectors not yet covered by a common apartment (meaning that there are no two elements, one of each class, contained in a common apartment). For each such pair $r := (q_1, q_2)$ we pick two disjoint sub-Weyl chambers S_r^1 and S_r^2 , both contained in vector Weyl chambers of a copy $\mathbb{A}_r$ of the model space $\mathbb{A}$, and such that S_r^1 and S_r^2 are disjoint with the centered ball of radius λ_{i+1} in $\mathbb{A}_r$. Let π_r be the canonical isometry from $\mathbb{A}$ to $\mathbb{A}_r$. Let π_r^1 and π_r^2 be the canonical isometries from S_r^1 and S_r^2 to respectively S_{q_2} and S_{q_1} .

The set of points X_{i+1} of the space we want to construct is the union of the sets X'_i and $\mathbb{A}_r \setminus (S_r^1 \cup S_r^2)$ for each r in R . The set of charts $\mathcal{A}_{i+1}$ is $\mathcal{A}'_i$ extended with a chart

$$g_r : a \in \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \begin{cases} \pi_r(a) & \text{if } \pi_r(a) \notin S_r^1 \cup S_r^2 \\ \pi_r^1(a) & \text{if } \pi_r(a) \in S_r^1 \\ \pi_r^2(a) & \text{if } \pi_r(a) \in S_r^2 \end{cases}$$

for each r in R .

We now claim that $(X_{i+1}, \mathcal{A}_{i+1})$ is λ_{i+1} -admissible space. Conditions (T0) and (T3) are automatically satisfied. In order to see conditions (T1) and (T2) note that for any two points

$a \in S_q$ and $b \in S_{q'}$, where q, q' are two distinct parallelism classes in Q , one has that a and b are not contained in a common apartment by condition (T2) for $(X'_i, \mathcal{A}'_i)$.

9.3. Direct limit and conclusion. By repeating the extension procedure laid out in the previous sub-section one obtains sets of points $X_i \subset X_{i+1} \subset X_{i+2} \subset \dots$ and sets $\mathcal{A}_i \subset \mathcal{A}_{i+1} \subset \mathcal{A}_{i+2} \subset \dots$ of injections. Let

$$X_\infty = \bigcup_{j=i}^{\infty} X_j \text{ and } \mathcal{A}_\infty = \bigcup_{j=i}^{\infty} \mathcal{A}_j.$$

This direct limit yields a space $(X_\infty, \mathcal{A}_\infty)$ modeled on $\mathbb{A} = \mathbb{A}(\Phi, \Lambda)$. In order to satisfy axiom (A1) we replace $\mathcal{A}_\infty$ by the set $\mathcal{A}'_\infty = \{f \circ w \mid f \in \mathcal{F}, w \in W\}$. The space $(X_\infty, \mathcal{A}'_\infty)$ satisfies axiom (A2) by condition (T1) for the intermediate steps. The repetition of the first and second step of the procedure implies that $(X_\infty, \mathcal{A}_\infty)$ satisfies axioms (A3) and (A4) as well.

If the dimension of $\mathbb{A}$ is at least 2 then no two apartments intersect in a half-apartment by condition (T2) for the intermediary steps, so axiom (A6) is satisfied vacuously. So in this case we obtain a space which satisfies axioms (A1)–(A4) and (A6). However it cannot consist of more than a single apartment and satisfy axiom (A5) at the same time because if it would, then there would be apartments intersecting in half-apartments (see for example [Par00, Prop. 1.7]). By Theorem 3.2 it cannot satisfy (TI) either then.

A more direct way to obtain an example which does not satisfy (TI) is to start from a λ_1 -admissible space (for a suitable choice of λ_1) which does not satisfy (TI). An example would be three apartments glued pairwise together at a (distinct) point. The three glueing points form a triangle, for which the side lengths can be chosen such that they violate the triangle inequality.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [Ben90] C. D. Bennett. Affine Λ -buildings. *Dissertation, Chicago Illinois*, pages 1–106, 1990.
- [Ben94] C. D. Bennett. Affine Λ -buildings. I. *Proc. London Math. Soc.* (3), 68(3):541–576, 1994.
- [Bro89] K. S. Brown. *Buildings*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1989.
- [BT72] F. Bruhat and J. Tits. Groupes réductifs sur un corps local. *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.*, (41):5–251, 1972.
- [Hit09] P. Hitzelberger. Generalized affine buildings: Automorphisms, affine Suzuki-Ree-buildings and convexity. *arXiv:0902.1107v1, Dissertation, Münster*, 2009.
- [Hit11] P. Hitzelberger. Non-discrete affine buildings and convexity. *Adv. Math.*, 227(1):210–244, 2011.
- [KL97] B. Kleiner and B. Leeb. Rigidity of quasi-isometries for symmetric spaces and Euclidean buildings. *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.*, (86):115–197, 1997.
- [KSTT05] L. Kramer, S. Shelah, K. Tent, and S. Thomas. Asymptotic cones of finitely presented groups. *Adv. Math.*, 193(1):142–173, 2005.
- [KT04] L. Kramer and K. Tent. Asymptotic cones and ultrapowers of Lie groups. *Bull. Symbolic Logic*, 10(2):175–185, 2004.
- [Par00] A. Parreau. Immeubles affines: construction par les normes et étude des isométries. In *Crystallographic groups and their generalizations (Kortrijk, 1999)*, volume 262 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 263–302. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2000.
- [Ron89] M. Ronan. *Lectures on buildings*, volume 7 of *Perspectives in Mathematics*. Academic Press Inc., Boston, MA, 1989.
- [SnHS11] P. N. Schwer (née Hitzelberger) and K. Struyve. Λ -buildings and base change functors. *to appear in Geometriae Dedicata*. DOI: 10.1007/s10711-011-9611-2, 2011.
- [Tit86] J. Tits. Immeubles de type affine. In *Buildings and the geometry of diagrams (Como, 1984)*, volume 1181 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 159–190. Springer, Berlin, 1986.

CURTIS D. BENNETT, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, LOYOLA MARYMOUNT UNIVERSITY, 1 LMU DRIVE,
SUITE 2700 LOS ANGELES, CA 90245

PETRA N. SCHWER, MATHEMATICAL INSTITUTE, UNIVERSITY OF MÜNSTER, EINSTEINSTRASSE 62, 48149
MÜNSTER, GERMANY

KOEN STRUYVE, DEPARTMENT OF PURE MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER ALGEBRA, GHENT UNIVERSITY,
KRIJGSLAAN 281, B-9000 GHENT, BELGIUM

E-mail address: `cbennett@lmu.edu`, `petra.schwer@wwu.de`, `kstruyve@cage.ugent.be`